UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,667	11/21/2003	Andreas Kaszkin	Q78536	9058
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 03/17/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			TRUONG, THANHNGA B	
	SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2435	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/717,667	KASZKIN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	THANHNGA B. TRUONG	2435			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 N This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o 					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se cion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/717,667 Page 2

Art Unit: 2435

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on November 21, 2008. Claims 1-7 are pending. Claims 8-12 are canceled by the applicant. At this time, claims 1-6 are allowed and claim 7 is still rejected.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 7 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al (US 6,507,856 B1), in view of Takagi et al (US 5, 109,152), and further in view of Dillon et al (US 5, 109,152).
 - a. Referring to claim 7:
- i. Chen teaches a process device for a process automation system, comprising:
- (1) a function device executing predetermined functions as part of process automation; and a communication device connected to the function device and configured to connect into a process automation system for exchange of data, within the process automation system, that relate to at least one of the functions and the function device (see Chen's abstract, Figures 5 and 6; column 3, lines 35-49; and column 4, lines 57-58 of Chen),
- ii. Although Chen teaches a process automation system, Chen is silent on the capability of showing wherein the communication device comprises an encryption device, a decryption device, and means for determining by hard wiring or programming which of transmission data are encrypted in the encryption device and

Application/Control Number: 10/717,667

Art Unit: 2435

means for recognizing which of reception data are encrypted and decrypting the encrypted reception data in the decryption device. On the other hand, Takagi teaches these limitations in Figure 9 and more details in column 1, lines 17-43, column 6, lines 35-45 of Takagi.

- iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:
- (1) have modified the invention of Chen with the teaching of Takagi for performs, between two communication devices, the confirmation of legitimacy of the communication partner and the implementation of confidentiality and recognition of transmitted messages (column 1, lines 5-10 of Takagi).
 - iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

Page 3

- (1) have modified the invention of Chen with the teaching of Takagi for dynamically exchanging and merging documents (column 1, lines 31-32 of Chen).
- v. Although the combination of teaching between Chen and Takagi teaches the claimed subject matter, they are silent on the capability of recognizing which of reception data are encrypted. On the other hand, Dillon teaches this limitation in **column 3**, **lines 12-14 of Dillon**.
- vi. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:
- (1) have modified the modified-invention of Chen with the teaching of Dillon for performs, between two communication devices, the confirmation of legitimacy of the communication partner and the implementation of confidentiality and recognition of transmitted messages (column 1, lines 5-10 of Takagi).
 - vii. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:
- (1) have modified the invention of Chen with the teaching of Takagi for dynamically exchanging and merging documents (column 1, lines 31-32 of Chen).

Application/Control Number: 10/717,667 Page 4

Art Unit: 2435

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-6 are allowed.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

/Thanhnga B. Truong/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2435

TBT

March 14, 2009